DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 782 SP 012 031

AUTHOR Bullock, William, Jr.
TITLE Control and Satisfaction in Schools of Education: An Analysis of Faculty Perceptions.
PUB DATE [68]
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; College Deans; *College Faculty; *Job Satisfaction; *Power Structure; *Schools of Education

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between variables of influence and faculty satisfaction in organizational settings as perceived by faculty members in five schools of education. It was hypothesized that influence characteristics of school of education deans would be significantly related to faculty satisfaction. One hundred sixty five faculty members of schools of education at five universities were polled. Dependent variables consisted of three dimensions of faculty satisfaction. Independent variables consisted of dean influence, total influence, and five dimensions of social power (legitimate, expert, referent, reward, and coercive). Mean and standard deviations for variables of dean influence, and mean ranking of the five dimensions of social power are given. Mean rankings for dimensions of social power characterizing faculty influence are indicated. Findings of the study are inconsistantly supportive of the hypothesis. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148782

1693

Control and Satisfaction in Schools of Education

An Analysis of Faculty Perceptions

William Bullock, Jr.

School of Education, The College of William and Mary

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Bullock, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Running head: Control and Satisfaction Analysis in Schools of Education

SP012 031

Control and Satisfaction in Schools of Education: An Analysis of Faculty Perceptions

Administrative control and subordinate satisfaction are essentials of organizations. Without these elements, organized effort would be minimal or non-existent. Productivity would be marginal because a stable base for achieving work objectives would be lacking.

Tannenbaum (1968) wrote that control has been used synonymously with power, authority, and influence. It it is now used to mean power and influence. Control was defined by him as meaning "any process in which a person or group of persons or organization of persons determines, that is, intentionally affects the behavior of another person, or group or organization." If O performs an act which results in a change in a particular state of P, we can say O influenced P with respect to that specific state (Cartwright and Zander, 1968).

Power or influence over another person or collection of persons is not a one dimensional phenomenon. Franch and Raven (1959) have identified five types or bases of power:

(1) Reward power, based on P's perception that O has the ability to mediate rewards for him; (2) coercive

> power, based on P's perception that O has the ability to mediate punishments for him; (3) legitimate power, based on the perception by P that O has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior for him; (4) referent power, based on P's identification with O; (5) expert power, based on the perception that O has some special knowledge or expertness. (p. 155)

Implied is that most people have the potential ability to influence another person or group of persons through reliance on any one of these five dimensions of social power. The degree of effective influence one person might have over another is probably determined by the type of power used. Research data seem to bear this out.

In a study of influence patterns of office managers and subordinate satisfaction reported by Bachman, Smith, and Slesinger (1966), it found that satisfaction with branch office managers grew from perceptions of subordinates that their managers' skills rested upon expert and referent power. Less effective office managers were perceived as those who rely on reward, coercive, and legitimate power. Although legitimate power was found to be a dominant variable of control, it was shown not to be significantly correlated with satisfaction.

Another study of control and satisfaction was done at twelve

liberal arts colleges (Bachman, 1968). Ranked by faculty as most prominent in achieving faculty compliance was reliance by the dean on expert power. Revealed as moderately important influencers on faculty behavior were legitimate and referent power. Found as least important influencers of compliant behavior were reward and coercive power. Correlating positively with faculty satisfaction were expert and referent power. Correlating negatively with faculty satisfaction were legitimate, reward, and coercive power. The author concluded that "the effective [academic] dean is influential through personal qualities such as expertise and respect, rather than basing his influence upon legitimate authority and the use of punishments and rewards."

In a replication of earlier investigations of administrative influence and subordinate satisfaction, Hornstein, Callahan, Fisch, and Benedict (1968) analyzed control variables relied upon by school principals from data furnished by primary school teachers. Similar to other research findings, expert and referent power were found to be positively associated with faculty satisfaction. Reward, coercive, and legitimate power were found as not positively associated with faculty satisfaction.

Summarizing findings of research on control and satisfaction in five organizational settings Bachman, Bowers, and Marcus (1968) wrote the following:

> (1) Legitimate power was rated one of the two most important bases of power; however, it did not seem a consistent factor in organizational effectiveness, nor was it related significantly to total amount of control. (2) Expert power was the other very prominent basis of power, and it was strongly and consistently correlated with satisfaction and performance. Of the five bases of power, expert power was most positively related to total amount of control. (3) Referent power was of intermediate importance as a reason for complying with a supervisor's wishes, but in most cases it was positively correlated with criteria of organizational effectiveness. . . . (4) Reward power was also of intermediate importance; in this case the correlations with organizational effectiveness and with total control were not consistent. (5) Coercive power was clearly the least prominent reason for compliance; moreover, this basis of power was often negatively related to criteria of effectiveness . . . (p. 236)

The five dimensions of social power are shown as useful mechanisms for examining the control phenomenon in organizations. Analysis of the relatedness of these control dimensions to subordinate satisfaction has proven to be a feasible strategy for

exposing the effects of the many faces of power on organizational behavior.

The present study was designed to focus on the relationship between variables of influence and faculty satisfaction as perceived by faculty members in five schools of education. Faculty members in these organizational settings were selected because of their unique influence on public schools through their educational programs, the relative isolation of these professional schools within the university setting, and scarcity of data on these subjects. Moreover, data on effective control patterns should be of interest to potential deans.

The assumption is asserted that perceptions of faculty members accurately reflect characteristics of organizational relationships. Alluding to interactions of superordinates and subordinates, Likert (1967) wrote: "It is essential to keep in mind that the interaction between the leader and the subordinate must be viewed in light of the subordinate's background, values, and expectations. The subordinate's perceptions of the situation, rather than the supervisor's, determines whether or not the experience is supportive." No effort was made, therefore, to construct a statistical strategem to separate subjective views of respondents from any objective views of organizational structure. Indeed, there is question as to whether such a separation can be achieved efficiently. Although not

used to achieve the purpose of this study, statistical methods which purport to separate individual and structural effects were found (Tannenbaum & Bachman, 1964; Bachman, Smith & Slesinger, 1966).

Effort was made to replicate in part the investigation of dean's influence in liberal arts colleges (Bachman, 1968). It was hypothesized that influence characteristics of school of education deans are significantly related to faculty satisfaction. Expert and legitimate power are the two most prominent variables perceived as influencing faculty compliance with wishes of deans.

Method

Subjects and Location

Data for the present study were obtained from 165 full-time faculty members of schools of education in five universities. Each school of education has a dean who is the chief administrative officer. These particular organizations were chosen because they are relatively homogeneous with respect to geographic location, governance, and constituencies served. All the deans expressed willingness to support faculty participation in this project. Faculty size ranged from 27 to 110. Median size was 104 with a mean size of 88. A total of 441 questionnaires were distributed. One follow-up letter was sent to all faculty

members. After a month a second follow-up letter was sent to a selected sample of faculty members. Returns ranged from 29 percent to 67 percent. The relatively small number of returns constituted an acceptable response to achieve the objective established for this study.

Measures

All data presented here came from responses to a questionnaire devised by researchers at the Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan. It was modified slightly to make it appropriate for faculty members of schools of education. No effort was made to make substantive changes in the instrument. Dependent variables consist of three dimensions of faculty satisfaction. Independent variables consist of dean influence, total influence, and five dimensions of social power. Only limited portions of the questionnaire were used to obtain data for this report.

Influence. Influence on school of education policies and actions was obtained by the following question: "In general, how much influence does each of the following groups or persons actually have in determining the policies and actions of your institution?" Responses related to board of trustees, president, school of education dean, department chairman, school of education faculty, and students as a group. A five-point scale, from (1) Little or none to (5) A great deal, differentiated the measures. By

substituting the word "ideal" for "actual" in the same type question, measurements of ideal influence were ascertained. Thus, measures were furnished for dean influence and total influence.

Dimensions of dean and faculty influence. The five bases of social power conceptualized by French and Raven (1959) formed the dimensions of dean influence characteristics. They are referent, expert, reward, coercive, and legitimate. From the following questionnaire items, respondents ranked the five dimensions in order of importance for complying with the wishes of the dean: "Listed below are five reasons generally given by people when they are asked why they do the things their superiors suggest or want them to do. Please read all five carefully. Then number them according to their importance to you as reasons for doing the things your dean suggests or wants you to do. Give rank "1" to the most important factor, "2" to the next, etc." In the analysis, rank values were reversed so that 5 represented most important, and 1 represented least important.

A. I respect him personally, and want to act in a way that merits his respect and admiration.

B. I respect his competence and judgment about things with which he is more experienced than I.

C. He can give special help and benefits to those who cooperate with him.

D. He can apply pressure or penalize those who do not cooperate.

E. He has a legitimate right, considering his position, to expect that his suggestions will be carried out.

The same dimensions were used to rank faculty influence over the dean. Recognizing that ranking of variables prevents them from being discrete, the researcher did partial correlations to control for each of the five variables. The unreported data suggested caution in interpretating results. Even with this caveat, there are advantages in forcing respondents to discriminate their reasons for compliance.

Satisfaction variables. Three measures of satisfaction were used. Overall job satisfaction was obtained by the statement: While no job can be expected to be perfect, there are really very few things that I would change about mine if I had the power to do so." Satisfaction with the dean was obtained by the statement: "All things considered, I am personally quite satisfied with the way the dean of my school fulfills his responsibilities." Measures of satisfaction were shown on a five-point scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The last measure of satisfaction was one designed to reveal the degree of commitment to current position. After noting a choice of another college or university, if any, each faculty member was asked to

indicate "minimum conditions under which you would leave your present position to accept a new one." Responses were placed on a seven-point scale from (0) "I would accept even if it involved about a 20% salary reduction" to (6) "I would not accept such a position, no matter how great a salary increase might be involved."

Results

Mean and standard deviations for variables of dean and faculty influence are presented in Table 1. The mean responses furnished the best estimate of organizational relationships. From these measures of influence and satisfaction, statistical correlations were calculated. The use of composites of mean scores is similar to the method employed in the aforementioned investigation of faculty satisfaction and academic deans' influence in twelve liberal arts colleges.

As summarized in Table 1, mean level of perceived dean influence was between moderate and considerable. Level of disagreement among faculty members is shown by the relatively large standard deviation. The mean level of perceived total influence (composite of mean scores of six hierarchical entities) was less than that of the dean. It, too, fell between moderate and considerable.

The mean rankings perceived for the five dimensions of social

Table 1

Dean Influence Characteristics and Faculty Satisfaction 12

Criteria: Means and Standard Deviations

	Mean Ratings (N=163-165)	Standard Deviations (N=163-165)
Influence by deans	3.749	0.952
Total influence	3.245	0.584
Bases of dean influences		
Legitimate	3.335	1.215
Expert	3.552	1.419
Referent	3.226	1.420
Reward	2.700	0.995
Coercive	2.196	1.539
Bases of faculty influence		
Legitimate	3.226	1.220
Expert	2.049	1.396
Referent	3.677	1.182
Reward	3.463	1.303
Coercive	2.534	1.316
Faculty satisfaction		
Minimum conditions for leaving	3.624	1.495
With job as a whole	3.067	1.169
With school of education dean	3.097	1.308

Note. Ranking scores under bases of dean and faculty influence for each of the dimensions were reversed. The largest score indicates of most importance, and the smallest score indicates of least importance.

power gave prominence to expert power, followed closely by legitimate and referent power. Perceived as least important were reward and coercive power. The relatively large standard deviations indicate that faculty members comply with wishes of deans for different reasons.

Mean rankings perceived for the dimensions of social power characterizing faculty influence were substantially different from those shown for dean influence. Perceived as the most important dimension of faculty influence was referent power, followed closely by reward and legitimate power. Ranked as least important were coercive and expert power. The relatively large standard deviations are indicative of a broad spectrum of perceptions.

Differences of perceptions with respect to dimensions of faculty influence between faculty members in liberal arts colleges and those in schools of education are noteworthy. The most important influence dimension perceived for deans in liberal arts colleges complying with suggestions or wishes of faculty members was legitimate power ("The dean feels that his job properly includes an obligation to consider and act upon my suggestions as a faculty member."). Whereas, the most important influence dimension perceived for deans in schools of education complying with suggestions or wishes of faculty members was

referent power ("The dean respects me personally, and wants to act in a way that merits my respect and admiration."). At the opposite end of the continuum, the least important dimension of faculty influence perceived by faculty members in liberal arts colleges was coercive power ("The dean knows that I could exert pressure and make his work more difficult."). And yet, the least important dimension perceived by faculty members in schools of education was expert power (The dean respects my competence and judgment about things with which I am more experienced than he.").

Mean scores under faculty satisfaction were near the neutral point on a five-point scale indicating a degree of indifference toward the dean and the job. Furthermore, commitment to the institution was shown by the score to be moderate.

Data in Table 2 summarize correlations of influence measures with faculty satisfaction measures. None of the satisfaction measures correlated significantly with the dean influence measure. Two of the satisfaction measures correlated significantly with the total influence measure. Almost all correlations under bases of dean influence were significant. Legitimate power was not correlated with any measure of satisfaction, and coercive power was not correlated with one of the measures. Expert and referent power correlated positively with satisfaction, whereas,

Table 2

Correlations of Influence Patterns with Faculty Satisfaction

	Faculty Criteria Scores		
	Satisfaction with job as a whole	Satisfaction with the dean	Minimum conditions for leaving
Influence by dean	0.0475	0.0212	0.1089
Total influence	0.1753*	0.1403	0.2943**
Bases of dean influence			
Legitimate	-0.0274	-0.0888	-0.0110
Expert	0.1783*	0.2661**	0.2179**
Referent	0.3128**	0.4309**	0.1939*
Reward	-0.1445	-0.1788*	-0.1551*
Coercive	-0.2867**	-0.3783**	-0.2671**
Bases of faculty influence			
Legitimate	0.2351**	0.1905*	-0.0102
Expert	-0.1496	-0.1411	-0.1200
Referent	0.0852	0.1697*	0.1159
Reward	0.1382	0.1691*	0.0389
Coercive	-0.1542*	-0.2909**	0.0118

Note. Degrees of freedom differ as responses varied from item to item. Therefore, N=155 to 165.

*p .05, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

**p .01, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

reward and coercive power correlated negatively with satisfaction.

Under bases of faculty influence, six of the fifteen correlations were significant. Legitimate power was positively correlated with satisfaction measures for the job and the dean. Referent and reward power were positively correlated with the satisfaction measure only for the dean. And finally, coercive power was negatively correlated with satisfaction measures for the job and the dean.

To learn more about the idiosyncratic perceptions of each school of education faculty, responses were analyzed by school of education. Separating the data brought into focus several noteworthy findings. Table 3 is a summary of means and standard deviations showing comparisons. For each dean, perceived mean scores placed his influence between moderate and considerable over the policies and actions within the institution. Although their scores were not much higher, deans of the two schools of education C and E were perceived highest in mean level influence. Yet, faculty members working with these two deans showed the lowest mean scores for satisfaction with the job as a whole and satisfaction with the dean. Their measures of satisfaction were smaller than the mid-point of a five-point scale placing them between disagree and neutral.

Mean rankings perceived for the dimensions of social power

Table 3

Dean Influence Characteristics and Faculty Satisfaction Criteria

Means and Standard Deviations

by Schools of Education

	Mean Ratings[a]					Standard Deviations[b]				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Influence by deans	3.611	3.482	3.974	3.718	3.805	0.916	0.849	0.885	0.916	1.100
Total influence	3.454	3.179	3.233	3.292	3.167	0.548	0.413	0.582	0.519	0.735
Bases of dean influence										
Legitimate	2.889	3.444	3.553	3.256	3.333	1.079	1.121	1.201	1.141	1.391
Expert	4.056	3.577	2.763	3.718	3.881	1.392	1.501	1.240	1.395	1.329
Referent	4.000	2.630	2.632	3.923	3.167	0.970	1.472	1.634	1.036	1.248
Reward	2.389	3.039	3.053	2.539	2.452	0.916	0.999	0.957	1.097	0.832
Coercive	1.889	2.308	3.000	1.564	2.119	1.324	1.644	1.786	0.968	1.485
Bases of faculty influence										
Legitimate	3.278	2.963	2.605	3.231	3.929	1.179	1.255	1.242	1.038	1.022
Expert	1.444	1.846	2.000	1.359	3.119	0.922	1.156	1.356	0.778	1.580
Referent	4.000	3.926	3.737	3.949	3.071	1.372	1.035	1.201	1.146	1.022
Reward	3.889	3.370	3.237	4.051	3.000	1.079	1.391	1.364	1.025	1.307
Coercive	2.389	2.962	3.316	2.410	1.738	0.608	1.428	1.297	0.993	1.289
Faculty satisfaction										
Minimum conditions for leaving	4.056	3.593	3.206	4.026	3.410	1.392	1.474	1.473	1.495	1.500
With job as a whole	3.222	3.148	2.684	3.475	2.905	1.114	1.200	1.188	1.037	1.186
With dean	3.944	3.037	2.342	3.875	2.714	1.110	1.224	1.214	0.939	1.274

Note. Mean ranking scores under bases of influence were reversed making largest scores most important.

[a] Letter indicates a school of education. n = 18, 27, 38, 39-40, 41-42.

[b] Corresponding school of education.

characterizing influence patterns of dean C gave most prominent rank to reward power, followed closely by coercive power. Expert and referent power were ranked as least important to this dean.

Mean rankings perceived for these power dimensions characterizing influence patterns of dean E tended to be more typical of subordinates' perceptions in past studies. Most prominent rank was given to expert power, followed closely by legitimate power. Reward and coercive power were ranked as least important to this dean.

Correlations for each of the schools of education are presented in Tables 4, 5, and 6. It may be seen that only one of the satisfaction measures correlated significantly with the dean influence measure. Two of the satisfaction measures from one school correlated significantly with total influence measure. One of the satisfaction measures from another school correlated significantly with total influence measure.

Under bases of dean influence, referent power correlated positively with job satisfaction in two schools. Expert and referent power correlated positively with dean satisfaction variable in two schools. Coercive power correlated negatively with this variable in two schools. Turning to the last satisfaction variable, minimum conditions for leaving, expert power correlated positively and coercive power correlated negatively with it in one

Table 4

Correlations of Influence Patterns with Job Satisfaction by Schools of Education

	Satisfaction with job as a whole				
	A	B	C	D	E
Influence by dean	-0. 2560	-0. 3371	0. 2747	0. 1349	0. 2177
Total influence	-0. 1588	-0. 0297	0. 3176*	0. 1171	0. 2565
Bases of dean influence					
Legitimate	0. 3254	-0. 0509	0. 0688	-0. 2338	0. 0197
Expert	0. 2191	0. 1820	0. 1130	0. 0735	0. 1629
Referent	0. 1632	0. 3592	0. 3561*	-0. 0149	0. 3243*
Reward	-0. 0320	-0. 2352	-0. 2465	0. 1674	-0. 2519
Coercive	0. 0975	-0. 3200	-0. 3185	-0. 0040	-0. 3259
Bases of faculty influence					
Legitimate	0. 5773**	0. 4125*	0. 3162*	-0. 1616	0. 1554
Expert	0. 0700	-0. 2288	-0. 2182	0. 0820	-0. 0459
Referent	0. 2693	-0. 0218	-0. 1545	0. 0860	0. 1669
Reward	-0. 1251	0. 0581	0. 3643*	0. 0754	-0. 1102
Coercive	-0. 1351	-0. 1667	-0. 2669	-0. 1616	-0. 0008

Note. Each of the five schools of education is designated by letter. Degrees of freedom differ as responses varied from item to item and school to school.

*p . 05, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

**p . 01, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

School A: n =18; School B: n = 27; School C: n = 34-38; School D: n = 38-39; School E: n = 39-42.

Table 5

Correlations of Influence Patterns with Satisfaction 20

with the Dean by Schools of Education

	Satisfaction with the dean				
	A	B	C	D	E
Influence by dean	-0. 2538	-0. 0178	0. 1092	0. 0711	0. 2223
Total influence	-0. 2302	0. 3032	0. 1904	0. 0328	0. 1041
Bases of dean influence					
Legitimate	0. 1911	-0. 0125	-0.0775	-0. 1387	-0. 0138
Expert	0. 5732**	0. 1297	0. 2707	-0. 1669	0. 3251*
Referent	0. 1093	0. 3068	0. 555**	-0. 1171	0. 3988**
Reward	-0. 2088	-0. 1948	-0. 1787	0. 2194	-0. 2891
Coercive	0. 0756	-0. 2764	-0. 5484**	0. 2808	-0. 4070**
Bases of faculty influence					
Legitimate	0. 1924	0. 4515*	0. 2712	0. 0014	0. 1713
Expert	-0. 0319	-0. 4436*	-0. 3448*	0. 1351	0. 4412**
Referent	0. 3090	0. 1844	0. 1375	0. 0421	-0. 0214
Reward	-0. 0546	0. 2401	0. 3087	-0. 0201	-0. 2783
Coercive	0. 3149	-0. 3800	-0. 3966**	0. 0014	-0. 3140*

Note. Each of the five schools of education is designated by letter. Degrees of freedom differ as responses varied from item to item and school to school.

*p . 05, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

**p . 01, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

Table 6

Correlations of Influence Patterns with Minimum 21

Conditions for Leaving by Schools of Education

	Minimum conditions for leaving				
	A	B	C	D	E
Influence by dean	0.1563	-0.0523	0.2002	-0.0240	0.3203*
Total influence	0.2350	0.0717	0.4264**	0.1830	0.3623*
Bases of dean influence					
Legitimate	-0.3482	-0.1655	0.1988	0.0114	0.0919
Expert	0.1501	0.2156	0.2689	-0.0721	0.3832*
Referent	0.1742	0.3001	0.1600	-0.2223	0.2564
Reward	0.3048	-0.1831	-0.3117	0.0555	-0.3416
Coercive	-0.1242	-0.2568	-0.3055	-0.2634	-0.4691**
Bases of Faculty influence					
Legitimate	0.0618	0.1578	-0.0156	-0.2416	0.0141
Expert	-0.5246*	-0.1218	0.0041	0.1959	-0.1030
Referent	0.3080	0.2315	0.1187	-0.1541	0.0972
Reward	0.0827	0.0201	-0.0256	0.0163	-0.1058
Coercive	-0.2356	-0.1676	-0.0556	0.2591	0.1686

Note Each of the five schools of education is designated by letter. Degrees of freedom differ as responses varied from item to item and school to school.

*p .05, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

**p .01, two-tailed Pearson correlation.

school.

Discussion

It was hypothesized that influence characteristics of school of education deans are significantly related to faculty satisfaction. Of the five influence dimensions, expert and legitimate power are the most important variables which lead to faculty compliance with the wishes of the dean.

The findings of this study are inconsistently supportive of the hypothesis. Although it was established that expert power (competence and judgment about things from experience) was positively correlated with faculty satisfaction, it was not established that legitimate power (right by position to expect that suggestions will be followed) is a positive correlate of satisfaction. Although influence of the dean was shown as moderate to considerable, it was not positively and significantly correlated with satisfaction. The combined influence of six hierarchical levels of an institution in which faculty scores were included is shown as a significant factor in faculty satisfaction. Apparently, influence of the dean over policies and actions of the institution is not as important as influence of the faculty over those policies and actions.

Similar to other studies, the character of administrator

influence was perceived as a correlate of subordinate satisfaction. Expert and referent (personal respect and admiration) power correlated significantly with faculty satisfaction. Perhaps they are interrelated. If the faculty perceives the dean as competent in making judgments having a salutary effect on the organization, it is likely, also, that the dean will be admired and respected.

When perceptions were analyzed for each of the schools of education, the rank ordering of dean influence dimensions varied from school to school. No one dimension consistently correlated significantly with satisfaction measures. The reasons for these differences are doubtless imbedded in organizational and demographic characteristics.

The rank ordering and correlations under faculty influence are markedly different from those of members of liberal arts faculty. Bachman's (1968) data showed faculty reliance on expert and legitimate power, whereas, the data from this study showed faculty reliance on referent and reward power. It seems academic deans accede to wishes of the faculty because they feel an oblication to do so, and because they view the faculty as competent. On the other hand, school of education deans follow wishes of the faculty because faculty members are personally attractive and will reward the deans. Obligation to follow the

wishes of faculty members is only moderately important. Moreover, satisfaction with the dean emanates from this hierarchy of controls. Of interest, is the negative and significant correlation of coercive power with faculty satisfaction. The more faculty members resort to coercive means to win compliance of deans with their wishes, the less satisfied they appeared to be with their dean.

Several implications of this study are suggested. First, the satisfaction of faculty members in schools of education is not as dependent upon the dean's upward and lateral influence as past studies seemed to imply. The upward and lateral influence of the faculty as a unit is a more important element of satisfaction than influence of the dean. Next, As seen by the education faculty, the effective dean is one who depends heavily upon his own competence and personal attractiveness to influence organizational events. He is likely to shun dependence on reward and punishment mechanisms. Finally, the possibility exists that school of education faculty members who perceive that an effective strategy to influence deans to comply with their wishes is one which includes referent and reward power. These same mechanisms are likely to be depended upon to influence students and other external administrators. More work is needed to illuminate the reasons faculty members in schools of education ranked ordered faculty influence dimensions to give such little prominence to their expertise and right to expect the dean to

comply with their wishes because he has an obligation to do so.

References

Bachman, J. G. Faculty Satisfaction and the Dean's Influence: An Organizational Study of Twelve Liberal Arts Colleges. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52 (1), 55-61.

Bachman, J. G., Bowers, D. G., & Marcus, P. M. Bases of Supervisory Power: A Comparitive Study in Five Organizational Settings. In A. S. Tannenbaum (Ed.), Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968. Pp. 229-238.

Bachman, J. G., Smith, C. G., & Slesinger, J. A. Control, Performance, and Satisfaction: An Analysis of Structural and Individual Effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4 (2), 127-136.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. Power and Influence in Groups: Introduction. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), Group Dynamics Research and Theory (3rd ed). New York: Harper and Row, 1968. Pp. 215-216.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. The Bases of Social Power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1959. Pp. 155-156.

Hornstein, H. A., Callahan, D. M., Fisch, E., & Benedict, B. A. Influence and Satisfaction in Organizations: A Replication. Sociology of Education, Fall, 1968, 380-389.

Likert, R. The Human Organization Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967. Pp. 47-48.

Tannenbaum, A. S. Control in Organization. In A. S. Tannenbaum (Ed.), Control in Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968. P. 5.

Tannenbaum, A. S., & Bachman, J. G. Structural Versus Individual Effects. The American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 69, 585-595.